United Nations S/2009/112

Security Council

Distr.: General
24 February 2009

Original: English/French

Letter dated 23 February 2009 from the representatives of France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

We should be grateful if you would circulate to Security Council members the attached updated version of the United Kingdom-France non-paper on peacekeeping (see annex), as a document of the Security Council. This has been revised to take account of the discussion during the Security Council debate on peacekeeping on 23 January, and the informal seminar on 22 January.

We look forward to the first meeting of the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations under your Chairmanship on 25 February.

(*Signed*) Jean-Maurice **Ripert**

(*Signed*) Karen **Pierce**

09-24864 (E) 250209

Annex to the letter dated 23 February 2009 from the representatives of France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

[Original: English]

Non-paper

1. **Peacekeeping is an essential tool in the hands of the United Nations.** Looking back on the last 60 years, it has had a remarkable record in preventing war and suffering, and facilitating long-term political solutions in often intractable situations.

2. **United Nations peacekeeping has also had, and is still facing, serious difficulties.** Some are inherent to peacekeeping itself. Others are related to the specific division of responsibilities that characterizes the Organization, and the practices that have developed over time. Others are related to the current rapid growth in the number of operations, a critical factor at a time when resources are scarce. A final set is related to the increasing complexity of operations, and the general awareness that no sustainable peace can take hold without a comprehensive approach to the protection of civilians, justice, human rights, and peacebuilding. We need progress across all strands of this activity.

3. **The challenges are immense. In our view, several should be addressed as a matter of priority:**

Effective strategic oversight: the first area to address, as a prerequisite and a common denominator to all peacekeeping issues, is the quality of preparation, planning, oversight and evaluation of operations, in order to ensure there is progress towards a clear strategic goal. Considerable progress can be made by improving the information flow between the Security Council, the Secretariat, and troop-contributing countries; improving the quality of military advice available to the Council, risk analysis, and transparency across the chain of command; improving resolution drafting, including on benchmarks and completion strategies.

Resource constraints: there is an obvious overstretch, with huge costs, strains on efficiency on the ground and at Headquarters, which makes it more difficult to react to new crises. It can be addressed in six basic ways: (1) considering alternatives to peacekeeping and rigorously assessing new commitments; (2) substituting civilian activities for military activities where appropriate; (3) "outsourcing" activities to third parties and sharing the burden with other organizations; (4) closing existing operations; (5) downsizing existing operations; (6) increasing our cost-efficiency, including on the logistics and sourcing side. Serious efforts should be undertaken to address all six.

Lessons from implementation: there are gaps between mandates contained in Security Council resolutions and their implementation on the ground, which vary according to the provisions concerned, and to Force Commanders/Special Representatives of the Secretary-General and troop contributors in charge. Work should be undertaken to assess which mandate provisions are under-implemented and why. The aim should be to draw lessons for resolution drafters, for the composition of the mission and for dialogue with troop-contributing countries. This

assessment should also cover issues related to the implementation of complex mandates (balance and integration of civilian and military activities; implementation of provisions on human rights, protection of civilians, and judicial issues).

4. **While the Security Council has a special responsibility for peacekeeping under the Charter, peacekeeping is an equity of the whole membership and the whole United Nations system.** Our discussions should be conducted in closest coordination with the Secretary-General, the Secretariat, troop-contributing countries, and Member States hosting peacekeeping operations. Dialogue should also be intensified with the bodies and institutions that have complementary mandates in this area, including the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly, the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, the Peacebuilding Commission, relevant United Nations agencies and programmes, and the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping chaired by Japan.

5. **France and the United Kingdom intend to launch a collaborative process, with the aim of achieving a first set of concrete results by August 2009.** Our aim is for this process to be closely aligned with other reviews of peacekeeping being carried out by Member States and the Secretariat.

6. **As a first step, we propose to address the issue of effective strategic oversight.** A first series of proposals is articulated below, for the members' consideration.

Effective strategic oversight

Improving the preparation, planning, monitoring and evaluation of United Nations peacekeeping operations

In the light of the manifold increase in peacekeeping operations, the complexity and robustness of their mandates and the insecurity of the environments in which they take place, in-depth reflection is required, with a view to improving their preparation, planning, monitoring and evaluation.

In January 2007, the Council stressed in a presidential statement (S/PRST/2007/1) the "importance of a more strategic approach to the oversight and direction of peacekeeping, to maximize the prospects for successful transition in the countries concerned, and to make possible the most effective use of scarce peacekeeping resources". Such an approach is all the more relevant now, as evidenced in the recent Security Council debates on MONUC and the Kivu crisis.

In the United Nations system, the management of peacekeeping operations is decentralized. Security Council resolutions create peacekeeping operations and their mandates. The planning process and the monitoring are entrusted to the United Nations Secretariat. The operation itself is directed in the field by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the Force Commander, using the resources provided by troop-contributing countries. The capacity of the United Nations Strategic Military Headquarters in New York to provide direction and oversight to missions is limited.

Four issues, inter alia, deserve specific attention:

- how to reinforce the Council's and the Secretariat's work on preparation, planning and monitoring at the strategic level in New York;
- how to ensure that each Security Council member State receives coherent and accurate military analysis;
- how to reinforce the dialogue between the Council, the United Nations Secretariat and the troop-contributing countries on the military dimension of peacekeeping operations;
- how to improve mission effectiveness and how to embed best practice.

In this regard, the following actions could be considered:

A. Preparation and planning of operations

- Facilitate Security Council decision-making on the strategic effect required to maintain peace and security, how to respond appropriately to the threat to peace and security if there is one, including deciding whether a peacekeeping operation is appropriate, what its key tasks should be and how these should be reflected in the mandate, building on a sound strategic and military assessment.

To that end:

- The Security Council should develop the currently emerging practice of regular strategic joint briefings, both cross-cutting and on individual peacekeeping operations, by the Office of Military Affairs and the Department

of Peacekeeping Operations, with political-military experts of the Security Council. The Council should also ensure it has time, before a peacekeeping operation is mandated and at review points, to discuss fully and at high level the strategic context.

– Examine the means to provide Security Council members with adequate, high-quality military advice.

– The Secretariat may wish to consider providing more systematic reporting to the Security Council on strategic-level documents (i.e. CONOPS).

– The Secretariat may wish to consider providing the Security Council with early sight of the financial implications of its decisions.

• The Security Council should develop best practice for authorizing new missions, including a set of principles based on Brahimi, and drafting guidelines for resolutions.

• The Secretariat may wish to consider improving the strategic-level planning process and interaction with the field (Special Representative of the Secretary-General or Force Commander): adequate update of strategic-level documents to match the evolution of military requirements; ownership and validation of main documents elaborated in the field (i.e. OPLAN).

• Coordinated action to implement a more active policy of preparation and management of troop contributions to ensure adequately trained and equipped troops are deployed, by strengthening dialogue with troop-contributing countries, including on the issue of caveats. Long-term programmes of capacity-building, in both individual States and regional organizations, and improved sharing of peacekeeping military doctrine and best practice could contribute to this.

Throughout the planning and preparation stage, two overriding principles should apply:

– Mandates should have clear strategic political objectives and should identify key benchmarks which the Secretary-General can report against and which the Council can base its evaluations on.

– All relevant parts of the United Nations system should be brought into the process as early as possible, to ensure a joined-up approach and to maximize the prospects for success on the ground.

B. Monitoring and conduct of operations

• The Security Council and Secretariat should ensure they improve their exchange of information, and the quality of that information, on the conduct of operations, in particular more complex operations, through regular and ad hoc meetings, at the level of political-military experts of the Council. The Council and Secretariat could also agree on guidelines on the information that should be included in the reports of the Secretary-General. Increased involvement of troop-contributing countries would also be desirable. This will enable the Security Council to update or reduce tasks and adjust the level of resources to meet these tasks. It will also aid the Council in monitoring success.

- The Secretariat may wish to strengthen monitoring capabilities in New York, including the ability to generate without delay appropriate information on the military situation and the actions carried out by the peacekeeping operation, with a view to:

– having an assessment of the situation;

– being in a position to inform the Council and capitals.

To that end, it would be important to increase the military information flow between the Secretariat and the field.

- There should be some reflection on the regulatory framework under which Secretariat staff operate in the field, which was not designed for fast-moving, complex operations in high-risk environments, and on the amount of administration field staff have to deal with, which diverts them from political/strategic tasks.

C. Evaluation of operations

- The Security Council and the Secretariat should improve dialogue on the evaluation of operations, including convening systematically, before mandate renewals, meetings of political-military experts of the Council with the Secretariat.

- The Council and the Secretariat may wish to consider strengthening its evaluation process through:

– a better integration into the evaluation process of the objectives laid down in the planning documents;

– involvement of the Council's military and peacekeeping experts in the evaluation process;

– better taking into account the result of evaluations in deciding on mandate renewal and adaptation;

– better dialogue with troop-contributing countries to draw conclusions on the action of each contingent deployed within an operation.